

*REMARKS/ARGUMENTS*

In response to the Office Action mailed September 12, 2007, Applicant amends his application and requests reconsideration. No claims are added or cancelled so that claims 1-26 remain pending.

The invention is directed to an arrangement in which a liquid crystal display and a transparent cover are held in place on a hinged door of a gaming machine. As explained in the patent application, these elements mounted on the door can be relatively heavy and can be subjected to vibration and other forces upon opening and closing of the door. The invention resolves the problem by providing for damping of vibrations through resilient mounting of the liquid crystal display unit, and the transparent member, with the assistance of at least one rubber buffer interposed between the door and the liquid crystal display unit.

In this Amendment the claims are amended to describe the buffer as being rubber, in accordance with the repeated description in the patent application, for example, at page 16, lines 7-10, that the buffers are rubber. The only other claim amendments are related to issues of clarity and form.

All examined claims were rejected as anticipated by Cole (U.S. Patent 6,475,087). This rejection is respectfully traversed. It is fundamental that to anticipate a claim a prior art publication must disclose every element of the claim. Thus, because no element of Cole used to mount any display unit is ever described as being resilient or rubber, Cole cannot anticipate any claim now pending. For that reason, the single rejection must be withdrawn.

Although the foregoing simple explanation demonstrates that no claim can be anticipated by Cole, because the alleged buffer 74 of Cole is not rubber, independent of that distinction, nearly all of the dependent claims have also been erroneously rejected. Those rejections are erroneous, independent of the rejection of claim 1,

because those claims include elements never disclosed by Cole. In fact, in most instances, the alleged counterparts of the claim elements that are missing from Cole were not even identified by the Examiner with respect to reference characters in the description or figures of Cole.

For example, since there is no rubber buffer in Cole, there is not a plurality of such buffers as described in claim 3. Moreover, if it is accepted that bracket 74 in Cole is some kind of buffer, it was not pointed out where there are multiple elements 74 in Cole that could be alleged to correspond to the plurality of buffers of claim 3.

Claim 4 and a large number of other claims describe the door as including a frame supporting the liquid crystal display unit. The Office Action does not identify any element in Cole corresponding to the frame because there is no such element in Cole. Apparently reliance was placed upon the door of Cole as corresponding to the frame but those two elements in the claims are clearly different from each other. The single door in Cole cannot be properly asserted to meet both limitations. For the same reasons, the rejections of claims 9 and 12-23, at least, are erroneous.

Further, claim 9 describes an engagement between a projecting rubber buffer and a hollow in an end face of the liquid crystal display unit. No similar engagement is described by Cole, so that Cole cannot anticipate claim 9.

In addition, Cole fails to show a second element 74 that might correspond to the second rubber buffer of claim 12. Claim 13 was rejected as analogous to claim 8 when those claims are not analogous to each other. Claim 13 describes a projection and cover arrangement between the liquid crystal display unit and the buffer that is not part of claim 8. Adequate attention should be given to claim 13 and its dependent claims, which are different from other claims.

One of those claims depending from claim 13 is claim 17. In the structure of that claim, a rubber buffer covers a corner of the transparent member. This corner cushioning is never even suggested by Cole, preventing Cole from anticipating claim 17.

Claims 20 and 25 also describe an arrangement involving the cutout and cooperating rubber buffers which has no counterpart in Cole and for which corresponding members in Cole were not identified in the Office Action. The rejection of these claims is clearly erroneous.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests attention to each of the dependent claims in the event the claims are not allowed in the next communication.

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-26 are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffrey A. Wyand Reg. No. 29,458  
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER  
700 Thirteenth Street, N.W., Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20005-3960  
(202) 737-6770 (telephone)  
(202) 737-6776 (facsimile)

Date:  
JAW:ves

December 11, 2007